1 2	MOLLY M. LENS (S.B. #283867) mlens@omm.com DANIEL M. PETROCELLI (S.B. #97802)	
3	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	
4	1999 Avenue of the Stars, 8th Floor Los Angeles, California 90067-6035 Telephone: +1 310 553 6700 Facsimile: +1 310 246 6779	
5	Facsimile: +1 310 333 6700 Facsimile: +1 310 246 6779	
6	Attornays for Defendant	
7	Attorneys for Defendant Paramount Pictures Corporation	
8	UNITED STATES DI	STRICT COURT
9		
10	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11		G N 222 GV 2046 DA
12	SHOSH YONAY and YUVAL YONAY,	Case No. 2:22-CV-3846-PA
13	Plaintiffs,	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT
14	V.	PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORPORATION'S REQUEST
15	PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,	FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
16	and DOES 1-10,	DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
17	Defendants.	Hearing Date: November 7, 2022
18		Hearing Date: November 7, 2022 Hearing Time: 1:30 PM Place: Courtroom 9A
19		Judge: Hon. Percy Anderson
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTIN

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE CASE NO. 2:22-CV-3846-PA [Proposed] Order

Pending before the Court is Paramount Picture Corporation ("PPC")'s Request for Judicial Notice in Support of Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint ("Request"). The Court will grant the Request.

Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence provides that a court "must take judicial notice if a party requests it and the court is supplied with the necessary information" of an adjudicative fact, where the fact is "not subject to reasonable dispute because it . . . can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." Fed. R. Evid. 201(b)(2), (c)(2). In ruling on a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, the Court may consider "documents attached to the complaint, documents incorporated by reference in the complaint, or matters of judicial notice . . . without converting the motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment." *United States v. Ritchie*, 342 F.3d 903, 907–08 (9th Cir. 2003).

Exhibits A and B to the McNally Declaration are copies of Ehud Yonay's 1983 article entitled "Top Guns" (the "Article") and the 2022 film *Top Gun: Maverick* ("*Maverick*"), respectively. Because the Amended Complaint alleges that *Maverick* infringes Plaintiffs' copyright in the Article, and discusses the purported similarities between the works, both works are subject to judicial notice and are otherwise incorporated by reference into the Amended Complaint. *See Silas v. HBO*, 201 F. Supp. 3d 1158, 1168 (C.D. Cal. 2016), *aff'd* 713 F. App'x 626, 627 (9th Cir. 2018).

Exhibit C to the McNally Declaration is a true and correct copy of the cover page from Ehud Yonay's 1993 book *No Margin for Error: The Making of the Israeli Air Force*. The Court may take judicial notice of the fact of the publication of this book because it is a fact that "can be accurately and readily determined from

1 sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." Fed. R. Evid. 2 201(b)(2). 3 Exhibit D to the McNally Declaration is a true and correct copy of an April 4 29, 1983 contract between Ehud Yonay and California Magazine, Inc. (the 5 "California Magazine Contract"). Because Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint 6 depends on the contents of the *California Magazine* Contract, see Am. Compl. 7 ¶¶ 21–29, 68, the Court may consider the Contract when adjudicating PPC's 8 Motion to Dismiss. See Zella v. E.W. Scripps Co., 529 F. Supp. 2d 1124, 1131 (C.D. Cal. 2007) (quoting *Knievel v. ESPN*, 393 F.3d 1068, 1076 (9th Cir. 2005)). 9 10 Finally, Exhibit E to the McNally Declaration is a true and correct copy of a United States Senate report of a 1975 hearing before the Committee on Armed 11 12 Services ("Senate Report"). Because courts routinely take judicial notice of 13 governmental documents under Rule 201(b)(2), the court will do the same with 14 respect to the facts contained in the Senate Report. See, e.g., Ning Xianhua v. Oath 15 Holdings, Inc., 536 F. Supp. 3d 535, 546 (N.D. Cal. 2021) (taking judicial notice of a Senate report); Lopez v. Bank of Am., N.A., 505 F. Supp. 3d 961, 969–71 (N.D. 16 17 Cal. 2020) (courts may generally take judicial notice of transcripts of congressional 18 hearings). 19 Accordingly, the Court hereby **ORDERS** that the Request is **GRANTED**. Judicial notice shall be taken of Exhibits A-E of the Declaration of Patrick S. 20 21 McNally. 22 IT IS SO ORDERED. 23 Dated: 24 The Honorable Percy Anderson Judge, United States District Court for the Central District of California 25 26 27 28